



Peer Review JAD Meeting

Date: February 17, 2005,
Time: 10:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.
Location: Rockledge 2, Room 6087
Advocate: Eileen Bradley
Business Analysts: Mark Siegert; Sophonia Simms

Requirements Analyst: Daniel Fox

Next Meeting: Monday, February 28, 10:00 a.m. –12:00 p.m., Rockledge 2, Room 6087

Action Items

1. (Group) Identify the list of actors associated with Peer Review. Outline activities for the actors under three timeframes: pre-meeting, meeting, and post-meeting.
2. (Tracey Soto) Explain the transition from the OPDiv scoring method to that of IAR/IMPAC II.
3. (Mark Siegert) What remodeling initiatives will have to occur for OPDiv integration? What is the data migration process? When will OPDivs have to use the system?

Documents

1. Activities Diagram

Meeting with Review Policy Council (RPC)

Eileen Bradley began the meeting by discussing a RPC meeting she, Mark Siegert, Daniel Fox and Sophonia Simms attended on February 16. Daniel briefed the RPC on updates and enhancements to IAR. The council requested information about the IAR releases coming out in April and information regarding the Review Users Group (RUG). When reconstituting the RUG, Eileen will ask the advice of the RPC about representation from each institute. Many valid questions were raised by the RPC. Eileen indicated that Sophonia gave a presentation describing the purpose and definition of a Joint Application Development (JAD). Eileen presented a vision for Peer Review redesign.

Business Process Modeling

Sophonia passed out a document on which a table illustrated what the group discussed at the last meeting on January 31. Today, the group edited and added information to that table in order to finalize the document. She reminded the group that the JAD needs to model the existing business process. The activities diagram, therefore, needs to be accurate. In addition to this, the group will also define all relevant actors as well as timing (pre-meeting, meeting, and post-meeting activities) to a greater level of detail. This chart is not yet chronological, but the timing and actors definitions should make it sequential. The group made the following changes to the business model:

Receive Applications

- *Change this heading to “Receive Competing Applications and Supporting Material.”*
- *Tom Tatham suggested that the model be clearer on terminology. An Appendix should refer to that assigned in the 398 and Supplemental material should be defined more generally, including other items sent to the group; for example, the clarification of human subjects should be listed.*
- *Remove “Receive Electronic Applications” and place it in the Parking Lot field. Though Just In Time (JIT) was brought up, the group agreed that it was not a factor, since it no longer has anything to do with Review. The group was reminded that the model should represent how the process is done now.*

Global Item: Supplemental Materials.

Assign Applications to IC/IRG

- *Remove “Check Basic Eligibility,” since it is the same thing as “Perform Admin. / Basic Screening.”*

Parking Lot: There should be an option entitled “Program Review for Program Elements.”

Assign Applications

- *There should be two different drill-down boxes entitled “Review Chiefs” (to include IRG/Branch Chiefs) and “IC Program Referrals” in order to properly illustrate the assignment process.*
- *Change “Assign Workgroup” to “Assign TO Workgroup.”*

Create / Maintain Meeting

- *Under “Determine Type of Meeting,” there will be a drill-down showing the different types of meetings. This would include the Mechanism (teleconference, face-to-face), as well as the Format (RFA, FACA, Non-FACA, RO1, SBIR, etc.).*
- *Place “Set Meeting Date and Location” and “Establish FACA / Non FACA” under “Determine Type of Meeting.”*

Global Issue: “Maintain Percentile Table.”

Parking Lot: Create an extra column heading for “Planning Activities” and create drill-down menu.

Prepare Applications for Meetings

- *This step places applications into a structure so that they can be put into IMPAC II.*
- *Enter in “Administrative Review.” The definition of this term may shift from heading to heading, but it is a necessary step here.*

Organize Meeting

- *Move “Create Subprojects” from “Prepare Applications for Meetings” under this headline.*

Global Issue: Communicate with Applicant.

Tom Tatham suggested that the group clearly define and outline the exact job of the reviewer. Eileen said that a good idea would be to get some local reviewers to sit in on the meeting so that the group could obtain clearer input. The group agreed that there should be another column added entitled “Conduct Scientific Review,” which designates what the group expects of the Reviewers. The group may further define reviewer activities at the next meeting. Eileen asked the group members to take the provided list of actors and identify activities for pre-meeting, meeting, or post-meeting. The following is the list of actors that the group will consider:

- Applicant
- Reviewer
- IC Program Staff
- Support Staff
- SRA
- GTA
- RR Officer
- CMO

Action: (Group) Identify the list of actors associated with Peer Review. Outline activities for the actors under three timeframes: pre-meeting, meeting, and post-meeting..

The group agreed to place the last three columns (Enter Application Scores, Generate Summary Statement, and Process Expenses) under one column entitled “Post Meeting Activities.” There will another drill down option called “Generate Post Meeting Data and Artifacts.”

Q. Will the OPDivs have to comply to NIH standards of scoring, since they have different ways of score formulation than IMPAC II?

A. Sophonia will clarify with Mark Siegert the level of remodeling that the OPDivs will have to undergo in order to comply and switch over to IMPAC II scoring and when they will have to switch over to this system.

Q. Will archive programs from the OPDiv programs be imported into IMPAC II?

A. Eileen does not know the answer to this yet, but will discuss the OPDiv conversion to IMPAC II with Mark Siegert and Tracey Soto. She also promised that, if the OPDivs did have any problems, she would personally sit down with them and show them the IMPAC II system.

Action: (Mark Siegert / Tracey Soto) Explain the transition from the OPDiv scoring method to that of IMPAC II.

Attendees

Bradley, Eileen (CSR)	Dortch, Eulas (HRSA)
Ellis, Bonnie (OD/DEAS)	Fox, Daniel (OD)
Musto, Neal (NIDDK)	Paugh, Steve (OD/LTS)
Petrosian, Arthur (CSR/SBIB)	Scheig, Bill (HRSA)
Sigler, Kristeena (CSR)	Simms, Sophonia (OD)
Soto, Tracy (OD)	Sweeney, Coral (SAMHSA)
Tatham, Tom (CSR)	Valeda, Kay (NHLBI)
Wojik, Brian (NCI)	Zucker, Sherry (OD)